

Serial No. 09/816,125

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2-4, 9, and 12-21 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 6-22 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

AMENDMENT OF CLAIMS 2-4, 9, AND 12-21

Claims 2-4, 9, and 12-21 have been amended only to clarify claim language.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action at page 3, claims 2-6 and 9-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692 to Theimer, et al. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Theimer, et al. is directed to a method for selectively delivering electronic messages to an identified user or users in a system of mobile and fixed devices. According to Theimer, et al., electronic messages intended for an identified user or users may be given a level of privacy and a level of priority, and contextual attributes for its delivery may be specified. The system of Theimer, et al. perceives these contextual attributes for the recipient, and determines a display property based on the contextual attributes perceived, the user profile properties of each user, and the level of privacy and the priority of the electronic message.

More specifically, according to the teachings of Theimer, et al., there is a user agent that represents users and manages the statuses of users and the computer devices that are used by users. For example, according to Theimer, et al., when a user A comes close to a user B, the user agent detects user B and forwards a message of user A to the computer currently used by user B. Both whether or not the message of user A is forwarded and who the message of user A is forwarded to are determined based on profiles and policies set in the user agent.

According to Theimer, et al., the user agent obtains user information of a user to be represented at start-up (see Theimer, et al. at col. 7, lines 60-63) and, in response to a request from each user device, determines whether or not the request should be processed. According to Theimer, et al., a request is made from one device related to a user to the user himself or herself (see Theimer, et al. at col. 11, lines 35-55). The user agent then processes, based on

Serial No. 09/816,125

the profiles or policies, an instruction to a device that a user uses or a device that becomes available for use, or a command (RPC) sent from a computer device which generates information about a user. Thus, based on the teachings of Theimer, et al., it is possible to process messages in accordance with the context and environment (location) of a user.

The present invention, in contrast to the teachings of Theimer, et al., changes a requestee's process for each request based on a requester, the content of the request from the requester, and the status of the requestee that receives the request. Specifically, independent claim 2 recites "preparing a processing policy in which processes for communication requests are set for each of the users, the processes each in turn being according to a first user from whom there is a request for communication with a second user, according to a status of the second user with whom communication is requested, and according to content of the requested communication, the processing policy including an attribute-assigning policy setting a relationship between the first user requesting communication and the second user." Independent claims 2, 3, 9, and 12-22 recite similar features. Thus, in a non-limiting example, the present invention provides for a flexible response based on the relationship between the requester and the requestee.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Theimer, et al. fails to teach or suggest the preparation of processing policies "according to a first user from whom there is a request for communication with a second user," "according to a status of the second user with whom communication is requested," and "according to content of the requested communication," as recited in independent claim 2. As similar features are recited in independent claims 3, 4, 9, and 12-22, Applicants respectfully submit that Theimer, et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 2-4, 9, and 12-22, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom. Accordingly, Applicants submit claims 2-4, 9, and 12-22, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action at page 6, claims 7-8, which depend from independent claim 4 discussed above, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692 to Theimer, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,943,478 to Aggarwal, et al. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Aggarwal, et al. is relied upon only to teach "the requesting of information content from

Serial No. 09/816,125

another terminal if the information content is not stored in the first recording medium." Aggarwal, et al. fails to teach or suggest "the processes each in turn being according to a first user as a communication requester who requests communication with a second user as a communication requestee, according to status of the second user with whom communication is requested, and according to content of the requested communication," as recited in independent claim 4.

Applicants respectfully submit that Aggarwal, et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Theimer, et al. noted above with respect to the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Theimer, et al. and Aggarwal, et al., whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of dependent claims 7 and 8. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 7 and 8 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

REQUEST FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative to schedule an Interview before issuance of the next Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 09/816,125

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 21 February 2006By: Allison Olenginski
Allison Olenginski
Registration No. 55,509

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: 2/21, 2006

STAAS & HALSEY

By: Mary C. McZornDate: 2/21/06